

Statistical Distance For Chaotic Maps

Ramandeep S. Johal,*

*Department of Physics, Panjab University,
Chandigarh -166014, India.*

e-mail: raman%phys@puniv.chd.nic.in

Abstract

The purpose of this letter is to define a distance on the underlying phase space of a chaotic map, based on natural invariant density of the map. It is observed that for logistic map this distance is equivalent to Wootters' statistical distance. This distance becomes the Euclidean distance for a map with constant invariant density.

*Postal Address: 1110, 36-C, Chandigarh -160014, India

Distance between two states of a system, defined in its space of states, is an important geometric concept. Actually, various kinds of distances (may not be metrics) exist in literature depending on need and utility. As early as 1922, Fisher [1] defined a distance function also called genetic drift, in population genetics studies. Wootters' distance [2] can be defined in a probability space as well as in the ray space of quantum states. Its extension to density matrices was achieved in [3]. Metrics based on information theory [4], which distinguish probability distributions have also been defined. Recently, Monge distance was defined between Husimi distributions [5].

These distances serve different purposes. They can be used to assess the accuracy of various approximation techniques [6]. A distinguishability metric also serves in quantum measurements, which detect weak signals [3]. Components of a metric tensor can be given definite interpretation in terms of uncertainties and correlations of operators generating evolution of quantum states [7]. Some distances possess a somewhat natural property that they are equivalent to the Euclidean distance between the respective states.

It appears that more attention has been given to defining distances for quantum state space. In the classical phase space, the natural distance is generally considered to be the Euclidean one. In this letter, I propose a definition for distance in classical phase space underlying a chaotic map. For simplicity, we confine ourselves to one-dimensional maps. As a typical example, we study logistic map $x_{n+1} = rx_n(1 - x_n)$, which is fully chaotic for $r = 4$ in the phase space interval $[0:1]$. This distance will have close similarity to the Wootters' distance, although it is determined solely by the dynamics of the map.

For our purpose, it is useful to review Wootters' idea of statistical distance on a probability space. It is sufficient to consider a system (e.g. coin) with only two possible outcomes. The probability space is then one-dimensional. Wootters defined the distance between two probabilities p_1 and p_2 as follows:

$$d(p_1, p_2) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left\{ \text{Maximum No. of distinguishable probabilities between } p_1 \text{ and } p_2 \text{ for } n \text{ trials} \right\}. \quad (1)$$

The final expression is then given by

$$d(p_1, p_2) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \int_{p_1}^{p_2} \frac{dp}{2\Delta p} = \int_{p_1}^{p_2} \frac{dp}{2\sqrt{p(1-p)}}, \quad (2)$$

where $\Delta p = \sqrt{\frac{p(1-p)}{n}}$ is the root mean square deviation in the value of p in finite number of n trials. Thus we obtain

$$d(p_1, p_2) = \cos^{-1}(\sqrt{p_1 p_2} + \sqrt{(1-p_1)(1-p_2)}). \quad (3)$$

Note that this distance is inherently not same as Euclidean distance. However, the transformation $p = \sin^2 \theta$ allows us to write $d(\theta_1, \theta_2) = (\theta_2 - \theta_1)$. Thus statistical distance becomes equivalent to Euclidean distance (angle).

Now we consider the case of chaotic maps. For such maps, it is known that the trajectory moves over a strange attractor which can have fractal dimension. In the usual box-counting algorithm, to assess the fractal or capacity dimension, we partition the phase space into boxes or intervals. We then count the number of times a particular interval is visited by the map. For an attractor with fractal dimension, the number of intervals with certain probability show power-law behaviour as the size of the interval is taken to zero. This helps us to determine the fractal dimension, which is intrinsically a property of the attractor, independent of the dimension of the phase space. Note however, that the intervals or boxes are *a priori* defined to be Euclidean or their dimension is the same as that of the embedding phase space. Now as the capacity dimension measures how densely a chaotic trajectory covers the phase space, similarly one can define a distance or interval in phase space measurable in terms the chaotic trajectory covers or fills that interval.

With this motivation, we define a distance for chaotic maps as follows:

$$d'(x_1, x_2) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Probability of visiting the interval} \\ \text{between } x_1 \text{ and } x_2 \end{array} \right\}, \quad (4)$$

where n is the number of iterates and x_1 and x_2 are any two points on the one-dimensional phase space in which attractor is embedded.

Let us apply this idea to the logistic map $x_{n+1} = 4x_n(1-x_n)$. We know an analytic expression for natural invariant density of this map exists, given by $\rho(x) = \frac{1}{\pi\sqrt{x(1-x)}}$. Thus the distance as defined in eq.(4) can be written as

$$d'(x_1, x_2) = \int_{x_1}^{x_2} \rho(x) dx \quad (5)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{x_1}^{x_2} \frac{dx}{\sqrt{x(1-x)}}. \quad (6)$$

Note the remarkable similarity of the above expression to Wootters' distance as given by (2). Thus the two distances are in fact equivalent.

We discuss a plausible reason for this equivalence. Wootters' distance is obtained essentially by counting the number of distinguishable states or points between p_1 and p_2 . On the other hand, the distance I define, measures the probability of visiting the interval between corresponding points, which is also the relative frequency $\frac{n_i}{n}$, where i stands for the interval (x_1, x_2) . So essentially, this distance also measures the number of times the trajectory comes into the specific interval. We can be sure that no point in the interval is visited more than once, because of the chaotic nature of the trajectory which ensures that same point is visited only after infinite number of iterations. So all points n_i , visited by the trajectory *are* distinguishable in this sense.

Now as such the distance defined in (4) is not the same as Euclidean distance. But applying the transformation $x = \sin^2 \frac{\pi y}{2}$, we can write $d'(y_1, y_2) = y_2 - y_1$. Note that this transformation is precisely the one that makes logistic map at $r = 4$ topologically conjugate to binary tent map, whose invariant density is $\rho(y) = 1$. Using this value for invariant density, we directly arrive at the result that $d'(y_1, y_2)$ is equal to Euclidean distance. In fact, any one-dimensional chaotic map with constant invariant density will give a Euclidean distance (within a multiplicative constant) according to definition (5). It is interesting to see that logistic map with non uniform invariant density also gives the same result. Naturally, the trigonometric transformation between x and y variables plays the key role.

One can look forward to extending this idea of distance to chaotic maps in higher dimensions. But more importantly, the simple example given above for one-dimensional maps should provide deeper insight into the relation between statistical fluctuations and the chaotic nature of the trajectory in the asymptotic limit ($n \rightarrow \infty$). Finally, we know the box dimension of a chaotic attractor tells us how densely the trajectory covers the underlying phase space. It is interesting to see whether in some sense, the distance defined above complements this role. More clear exposition of their relation will be highly welcome.

References

- [1] R.A. Fisher, Proc. R. Soc. Edinburgh, **42**, 321 (1922).

- [2] W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. D, **23**, 357 (1981).
- [3] S.M. Braunstein and C.M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 3439 (1994).
- [4] S. Kullback, *Information Theory and Statistics*, (J. Wiley, New York, 1959).
- [5] K. Życzkowski and W. Słomczyński, *Monge Distance Between Quantum States*, (preprint).
- [6] M. Raviculet, M. Casas and A. Plastino, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 1695 (1997) and references therein.
- [7] S. Abe, Phys. Rev. A **48**, 4102 (1993).
- [8] J.L. MaCauley, *Chaos, Dynamics and Fractals: An algorithmic approach to deterministic chaos*, Cambridge University Press, 1994, p. 75.